UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/847,391	05/02/2001	Vijaya Raghavan	04899-043001	6483

26161	7590	03/02/2004

FISH & RICHARDSON PC
225 FRANKLIN ST
BOSTON, MA 02110

EXAMINER
DO, THUAN V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2825	

DATE MAILED: 03/02/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary	09/847,391		RAGHAVAN ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Thuan Do		2825	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *08/28/01* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-26 are pending in this office action.

Claim objections

Claim 8, the terms "- - event E- - " and "- -threshold T- -" are unclear to what its

mean. Clarification or correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> (e) the invention was described in-
> (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or
> (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

2.   Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over

Schubert et al. Pat. No. 6581191.

Regarding claim 1: Schubert teaches a method comprising:

receiving in the system a description of a finite state machine including a

temporal logic condition (Figure 11 and col. 32, lines 35-67) ; and

generating code for emulating the described finite state machine (col. 1, line 57

through col. 2,line 7).

Regarding claim 2: Schubert teaches a method with:

the received description comprises at least two state definitions and at least one

definition of a transition between states (Figure 12 and col. 26, lines 1-17) ; and

wherein the received description comprises a conditional expression associated

with a first state of the finite state machine, the conditional expression comprising a first

temporal logic condition defined by a first temporal logic operator operating on an event,

the conditional expression defining a logical condition for taking a first action specified in the description (col. 32, lines 35-67); and

wherein generating code for emulating the described finite state machine comprises generating code for evaluating the conditional expression during emulation (col. 1, line 57 through col. 2,line 7 and col. 24, lines 5-28).

Regarding claim 3: Schubert teaches a method with:

generating code for declaring a counter variable that is not otherwise specified in the description of the finite state machine (col. 26, lines 1-10) ;

generating code for initializing the counter variable upon entry into said first state (col. 39, lines 34-40 a counter is started when the hardware is initialed) ;

generating code for incrementing the counter variable when said first event occurs (col. 37, lines 28-40) ;

generating code for performing a first test associated with said first temporal logic operator on the counter variable when said first state is active (col. 2, lines 14-49 and col. 26, lines 1-10); and

generating code for taking a first specified action based on the result of said first test (col. 39, lines 34-40).

Regarding claim 4: Schubert teaches a method with the conditional expression (col. 3, lines 18-30).

Regarding claim 5: Schubert teaches a method with transition (Figure 12).

Regarding claim 6: This claim teaches a method similar to the claims 3 and 1 and rejected in similar manner.

Regarding claims 7,12: Schubert teaches a method with graphical (col. 18, lines 38-40).

Regarding claims 8-11: Schubert teaches a method with event and threshold (col. 38, lines 11-65).

Regarding claim 13: Schubert teaches a method with a textual expression (col. 18, lines 10-16).

Regarding claim 14: Schubert teaches a method with a line connecting node (col. 1, lines 22-25).

Regarding claim 15: Schubert teaches a method with source code (col. 1, lines 57-67).

Regarding claims 16-20,23,24: These claims teach a method, program or system similar to the function of claims 1-15 and rejected in similar manner.

Regarding claims 21,22: These claims teach a method, program or system similar to the function of claims 1-15 and rejected in similar manner except the graphical user interface is rejected in the column 14, lines 27-42.

Regarding claims 25,26 These claims teach a method, program or system similar to the function of claims 1-15 and rejected in similar manner except the edition is rejected in the column 5, lines 57-67.

CONTACT INFORMATION

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuan Do whose telephone number is 571-272-1891. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-5:30 (except 2nd Fridays).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew S. Smith can be reached on 571-272-1907. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703 305-3431 for regular communications and 703-305-3431 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0596.

Thuan Do
Patent examiner
2/25/04